From: "Ware, David W. (ISB)" <david.w.ware@owenscorning.com>
To: "Elaine Hebert" <Ehebert@energy.state.ca.us>
Date: 11/30/2007 10:45 AM
Subject: RE: Is your computer/email up and running?

Elaine:
Thanks for sending this. I had actually started a "draft" response but seeing this helps me focus more fully on your words. I think you illuminated my points fairly well. Maybe adding an additional sentence or two to the bottom of that paragraph, something like this:

"At a public workshop on these obstacles and incentives in September 2007, a representative from Owens Corning, David Ware, brought up this point: there is a need for better communication between the private sector (researchers and manufacturers of construction products, such as his company), building specifiers/engineers/architects, and public entities that either sponsor research or develop building codes. Mr.. Ware gave an example: his company developed a new rigid insulation product that has very high R-value (resistance to heat passing through) per inch, and therefore only a thin layer would be needed to meet energy code insulation requirements. As with many products when first introduced to market, this one is relatively costly, but Owens-Corning expects the costs to drop as the product becomes known. Such a product has the potential to change how buildings are constructed; perhaps installing batt insulation between studs in wall and ceiling cavities would become obsolete over time. Manufacturers often have the ability to produce new and innovative products, such as products with very high R-values as just noted, but their focus for product development sometimes does not match building design constraints better seen through those in the construction or design side of the building community, or where limitations might be placed due to building codes. Hence, if there was a more robust process whereby manufacturers could learn of needed products long before designs were set for a given, project, product development could occur that more closely aligned with building needs. A good example of this is military aircraft development where the Department of Defense has overtime challenged aircraft manufacturers to develop new products that are lighter, stronger, yet more agile in flight and can be disassembled and repaired more easily, etc. Without clear guidance on needs, manufacturer building product R&D efforts often don't match the most significant building 'problem' or never fully realize their potential benefits."

I'm not sure why you want to call the recommendation area "Incentives", maybe a better statement is "Actions" as this implies something really will happen. Nevertheless, some language like this might help:

" Establish a state sanctioned Building Products and Construction Consortium managed through the Office of the State Architect to insure better communication and pathways/collaborative efforts between manufacturers of energy efficiency-related products, building code developers, regulators, architects and other specifiers and designers, researchers, and research funding to support development and market penetration of new technologies. Having access to state and private design needs, access to private and public research, and access to public and private co-funding opportunities, the Consortium will work towards development of new and innovative building products, processes, and the removal of barriers for integrating these technologies into the state's public and private built environment, with the goal of developing and

implementing at least two new products and/or building processes per year that have the potential to make significant positive impacts for buildings. This Consortium should meet on a regular schedule and report its progress quarterly to the Governor's office."

David W. Ware
Manager, Codes & Standards
Owens Corning
2280 Grass Valley Hwy, #172
Auburn, CA 95603
530.885.7558
david.w.ware@owenscorning.com

———

From: Elaine Hebert [mailto:Ehebert@energy.state.ca.us]
Sent: Thursday, November 29, 2007 6:32 PM
To: Ware, David W. (ISB)
Cc: Elaine Hebert
Subject: Is your computer/email up and running?

Hi Dave - Thanks for your return phone message. I haven't forgotten about you! I am struggling with how to word your item as you will see below. Help!

Obstacle 9. Lack of a communication feedback loop among building designers and specifiers, regulators and other public entities, and manufacturers of building products and their R&D departments (who create products for the market); building codes may not keep up with innovations.

At a public workshop on these obstacles and incentives in September 2007, a representative from Owens Corning, David Ware, brought up this point: there is a need for better communication between the private sector (researchers and manufacturers of construction products, such as his company), building specifiers/engineers/architects, and public entities that either sponsor research or develop building codes. Mr. Ware gave an example: his company developed a new rigid insulation product that has very high R-value (resistance to heat passing through) per inch, and therefore only a thin layer would be needed to meet energy code insulation requirements. As with many products when first introduced to market, this one is relatively costly, but Owens-Corning expects the costs to drop as the product becomes known. Such a product has the potential to change how buildings are constructed; perhaps installing batt insulation between studs in wall and ceiling cavities would become obsolete over time.

Incentives

Better communication pathways/collaborative efforts between manufacturers of energy efficiency-related products, building code developers, regulators, architects and other specifiers and designers, researchers, and research funders to support development and market penetration of new technologies.

>>>
Thanks,

Elaine